

1 Stacey M. Leyton (SBN 203827)  
2 Barbara J. Chisholm (SBN 224656)  
3 Danielle Leonard (SBN 218201)  
4 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP  
5 177 Post Street, Suite 300  
6 San Francisco, CA 94108  
7 Tel: (415) 421-7151  
8 Fax: (415) 362-8064  
9 sleyton@altber.com  
10 bchisholm@altber.com  
11 dleonard@altber.com

12 Elena Goldstein (pro hac vice)  
13 Skye Perryman (pro hac vice)  
14 Tsuki Hoshijima (pro hac vice)  
15 DEMOCRACY FORWARD FOUNDATION  
16 P.O. Box 34553  
17 Washington, DC 20043  
18 Tel: (202) 448-9090  
19 Fax: (202) 796-4426  
20 egoldstein@democracyforward.org  
21 sperryman@democracyforward.org  
22 thoshijima@democracyforward.org

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

24 [Additional counsel and affiliations listed on signature page]

25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
26 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
27 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

28 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,  
et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity  
as President of the United States, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:25-cv-03698-SI

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO SHORTEN  
TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND  
TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION**

**(LOCAL RULE 6-3)**

## INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs respectfully move for an order shortening Defendants' time to respond to a single targeted discovery request for communications between Federal Agency Defendants and Defendants Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"), Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), or Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") regarding Agency RIF and Reorganization Plans ("ARRPs") that provide essential evidence regarding the legality of decision-making and implementation of the ARRPs at issue in this case. *See* Local Rule 6-3. This request supplements this Court's prior expedited discovery order requiring Defendants to produce the ARRPs (and RIF-notice waivers or approvals (ECF 85)) that is pending before this Court for confirmation (ECF 177). Given the imminence of Defendants' actions to implement these ARRPs and the centrality of these communications to the contested legality of these actions, Plaintiffs request that Defendants be required to respond to Plaintiffs' request for all communications between Federal Agency Defendants and OMB, OPM, or DOGE regarding the ARRPs by July 25, 2025, including by producing all documents as to which no objection is asserted. This would shorten Defendants' time to respond from the usual thirty (30) to fourteen (14) days.

There is good cause to shorten the deadline, because these documents are highly relevant to the claims that the Supreme Court's recent stay order expressly leaves open: the "legality of any Agency RIF and Reorganization Plan produced or approved pursuant to the Executive Order and Memorandum." *See Trump v. AFGE*, 2025 WL 1873449, 606 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (July 8, 2025). There is no dispute that Defendants intend to immediately resume the large-scale RIFs and reorganizations that were previously enjoined and that are the subject of Plaintiffs' claims challenging the ARRPs. The forthcoming RIFs and reorganizations will cause irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs intend to expeditiously seek further interim relief as is warranted by the facts, circumstances, and law. Good cause exists to shorten the time to respond to this discovery request, which will permit the parties and the Court to evaluate the facts and legal issues that Defendants continue to contest.

Consistent with Rule 34, the Court's order should make clear that any documents as to which no objection is raised must be produced by this deadline. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(A), (B). Plaintiffs also respectfully request that in light of the exigent circumstances of this case, to the

1 extent that Defendants intend to raise any categorical objections, they should be required to  
 2 identify the bases for such objections in their response to this motion, so that such issues may be  
 3 resolved in advance of the deadline. Further, the Court should make clear that Defendants' Rule 34  
 4 response must include a privilege log for any documents for which Defendants assert privilege.

### 5 **BACKGROUND**

6 The Supreme Court's July 8, 2025 order, which stayed the prior preliminary injunction  
 7 issued with respect to Plaintiffs' separation of powers challenges to the EO and OMB/OPM  
 8 Memorandum, explicitly "express[ed] no view on the legality of any Agency RIF and  
 9 Reorganization Plan produced or approved pursuant to the Executive Order and Memorandum." S.  
 10 Ct. Order at 1. Justice Sotomayor's concurrence noted that the Supreme Court's decision leaves  
 11 this Court to "consider ... in the first instance" whether the agencies' ARRs "can and will be  
 12 carried out consistent with the constraints of law." *Id.* (Sotomayor, J., conc.).

13 On July 9, 2025, Plaintiffs requested that the Court confirm its prior order granting  
 14 expedited discovery with respect to Federal Agency Defendants' ARRs and deny Defendants'  
 15 request for reconsideration and protective order. ECF 176 at 1. The Court ordered Defendants to  
 16 respond to Plaintiffs' request by Monday, July 14. ECF 177.

17 That prior order granted expedited discovery requiring production of four types of  
 18 documents. ECF 85 (ARRs submitted to or approved by OMB/OPM; agency applications for  
 19 waivers of statutorily-mandated RIF notice periods; and OMB/OPM's responses). Plaintiffs' fact  
 20 development and investigation has shown that OMB and OPM have provided written responses to  
 21 at least some ARR submissions, and engaged in other communications regarding those  
 22 submissions in conjunction with OMB/OPM's "approval" process. *E.g.*, ECF 36, Ex. 1  
 23 ("Reviewers from [OMB] recently deemed the [NLRB's] rationale for avoiding layoffs inadequate.  
 24 'Without more, the agency cannot fully exempt itself from further staff reductions,' OMB staff said  
 25 in a response to the NLRB. The memo urged the labor board to 'think creatively' about how to use  
 26 a set of tactics, including layoffs, to reduce headcount."); ECF 37-12 ¶24 (OMB rejected  
 27 AmeriCorps ARR for not including RIF); ECF 37-32 ¶¶8-14 (NSF); ECF 96-1 ¶¶15-20 (same);  
 28 ECF 96-1 ¶¶6-13, Ex. 1 at 4-6 & Atts. D, I. (non-party NEH). And as this Court has recognized

1 during its review of Defendants’ assertion of deliberative process privilege, Defendants continue to  
 2 contest the most basic facts regarding these ARRPs, including whether OMB/OPM are approving  
 3 these agency proposals at all (and if not, then “pursuant to what, then, are the agencies  
 4 implementing their large-scale RIFs?”) (ECF 109 at 2).

5 On July 10, 2025, Plaintiffs provided Defendants advance notice of a Rule 34 request for  
 6 production of documents, invoking their Rule 26(d)(2) right to serve early Rule 34 requests that  
 7 would be deemed served as of a Rule 26(f) conference. Chisholm Decl. ¶2. That request was  
 8 deemed served on Defendants today, July 11, 2025, as of the parties’ Rule 26(f) conference. *See id.*  
 9 ¶4; Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(2)(b). Plaintiffs’ Request No. 1 seeks:

10 All communications between any Federal Agency Defendant and OMB, OPM, or  
 11 DOGE discussing any Agency RIF and Reorganization Plan (“ARRP”) (in whole or  
 12 any part), including but not limited to any approvals or disapprovals of those Plans  
 13 (in whole or any part, formally or informally) and any discussion of whether the  
 14 contents of those Plans meets or do not meet expectations, communicated by OMB,  
 15 OPM, or DOGE to any Federal Agency Defendant, from February 26, 2025 to the  
 16 present.

17 Chisholm Decl., Ex. A. In light of Defendants’ imminent intent to implement the ARRPs, Plaintiffs  
 18 requested that Defendants stipulate to answering this request within two weeks. *Id.*, Ex. B.  
 19 Defendants declined to stipulate to an expedited response time. *Id.* ¶4

## 17 ARGUMENT

18 There is good cause to shorten the response time for Request No. 1. The requested  
 19 communications between Federal Agency Defendants and OMB, OPM, and DOGE regarding  
 20 ARRPs are directly relevant and important to Plaintiffs’ claims challenging the legality of  
 21 OMB/OPM and Federal Agency Defendants’ approval and implementation of ARRPs (including,  
 22 as Plaintiffs contend, as directed by OMB/OPM/DOGE with respect to timing and content).

23 As this Court has recognized, Defendants contest essential facts relevant to these claims,  
 24 including which agency/agencies have made the actual decisions at issue regarding the content and  
 25 implementation of the ARRPs (ECF 109). They have repeatedly tried to shield their actions from  
 26 review by blocking public access to the ARRPs submitted or approved by OMB/OPM and basic  
 27 information about decisions regarding the ARRPs’ content and implementation. *See* ECF 109 at 1-  
 28

2. They continue to contend that OMB/OPM are not approving or disapproving, or not *formally* approving or disapproving, ARRP. *Id.* That is inconsistent with the record, which establishes that agencies were already implementing, or were poised to implement, their ARRPs, including through large-scale RIFs, and that the OMB/OPM Memorandum does not allow agencies to begin such implementation until the ARRPs are approved by OMB and OPM. ECF 100-2 at 3–4; *see also id.* at 6 (prohibiting implementation of ARRPs for agencies that provide direct services until specific OMB/OPM certification). As this Court found, OMB/OPM approval is a “necessary triggering step” in agencies’ RIF and reorganization processes. ECF 124 at 36. Given these established facts, the communications between the agencies and OMB/OPM will with certainty provide relevant evidence regarding the actions, and the legality of those actions, here at issue.

Further, the factual record regarding Defendants’ actions establishes that there are substantial communications between OMB/OPM/DOGE and the agencies regarding the content, timing, and decision-making with respect to agencies’ ARRPs. *See* ECF 124 at 36–37 (citing ECF 36, Ex. 1 (OMB/OPM returned NLRB’s proposed ARRP with notations that the cuts did not “meet expectations” and ordered resubmission of plan with greater cuts)); ECF 96-1 ¶¶8–14 (OMB, OPM, and DOGE rejected NSF’s phase 1 ARRP that lacked large-scale RIFs and directed large-scale RIFs instead); ECF 37-12 ¶¶24–25 (OMB rejected AmeriCorps’ mid-March ARRP that did not recommend RIFs and Americorps implemented large-scale RIFs shortly thereafter).

Therefore, communications between OMB/OPM/DOGE and the Federal Defendant Agencies regarding the ARRPs will shed light on OPM/OMB/DOGE’s orders and directives to agencies that may constitute approval or rejection (whether formal or informal) of all defendant agencies’ ARRPs, as well as the reasons and bases for Federal Agency Defendants’ actions in creating, modifying, and implementing ARRPs. Those communications are therefore highly relevant to the lawfulness of the ARRPs, including the question whether Defendants have exceeded authority or acted contrary to law, or are “engag[ing] in reasoned decisionmaking.” *Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.*, 591 U.S. 1, 16 (2020) (cleaned up). Any evaluation of Plaintiffs’ claims without these communications would be based on an incomplete picture of Defendants’ decision-making.



1 DATED: July 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 Stacey M. Leyton  
3 Barbara J. Chisholm  
4 Danielle E. Leonard  
5 Corinne F. Johnson  
6 Alice X. Wang  
7 Robin S. Tholin  
8 Aaron Schaffer-Neitz  
9 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP  
10 177 Post St., Suite 300  
11 San Francisco, CA 94108  
12 Tel: (415) 421-7151  
13 sleyton@altshulerberzon.com  
14 bchisholm@altshulerberzon.com  
15 dleonard@altshulerberzon.com

16 By: /s/ Corinne F. Johnson

17 *Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*  
18 *Plaintiffs*

19 Elena Goldstein (pro hac vice)  
20 Skye Perryman (pro hac vice)  
21 Tsuki Hoshijima (pro hac vice)  
22 DEMOCRACY FORWARD FOUNDATION  
23 P.O. Box 34553  
24 Washington, D.C. 20043  
25 Tel: (202) 448-9090  
26 Fax: (202) 796-4426  
27 egoldstein@democracyforward.org  
28 sperryman@democracyforward.org  
thoshijima@democracyforward.org

By: /s/ Tsuki Hoshijima

*Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization*  
*Plaintiffs (except NRDC) and for Plaintiffs City of*  
*Chicago, IL; Martin Luther King, Jr. County, WA;*  
*Harris County, TX; and City of Baltimore, MD*

Jules Torti (pro hac vice)  
PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT  
82 Nassau St., #601  
New York, NY 10038

Erica J. Newland (pro hac vice)  
Jacek Pruski (pro hac vice)



PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT  
2020 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 163  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: 202-579-4582  
jules.torti@protectdemocracy.org  
erica.newland@protectdemocracy.org  
jacek.pruski@protectdemocracy.org

By: /s/ Jacek Pruski

*Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization  
Plaintiffs (except NRDC)*

Norman L. Eisen (pro hac vice)  
Spencer W. Klein (pro hac vice)  
STATE DEMOCRACY DEFENDERS FUND  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue SE #15180  
Washington, D.C. 20003  
Tel: (202) 594-9958  
Norman@statedemocracydefenders.org  
Spencer@statedemocracydefenders.org

By: /s/ Norman L. Eisen

*Attorneys for All Union and Non-Profit Organization  
Plaintiffs (except NRDC)*

Rushab Sanghvi (SBN 302809)  
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT  
EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO  
80 F Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 639-6426  
Sanghr@afge.org

By: /s/ Rushab Sanghvi

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs American Federation of  
Government Employees, AFL-CIO (AFGE) and AFGE  
locals*

Teague Paterson (SBN 226659)  
Matthew Blumin (pro hac vice)  
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY,  
AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO  
1625 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 775-5900



TPaterson@afscme.org  
MBlumin@afscme.org

By: /s/ Teague Paterson

*Attorneys for Plaintiff American Federation of State  
County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO  
(AFSCME)*

Steven K. Ury (SBN 199499)  
SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL  
UNION, AFL-CIO  
1800 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 730-7428  
steven.ury@seiu.org

By: /s/ Steven K. Ury

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Service Employees  
International Union, AFL-CIO (SEIU)*

David Chiu (SBN 189542)  
City Attorney  
Yvonne R. Meré (SBN 175394)  
Chief Deputy City Attorney  
Mollie M. Lee (SBN 251404)  
Chief of Strategic Advocacy  
Sara J. Eisenberg (SBN 269303)  
Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation  
Molly J. Alarcon (SBN 315244)  
Alexander J. Holtzman (SBN 311813)  
Deputy City Attorneys  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY FOR THE  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
1390 Market Street, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
molly.alarcon@sfcityatty.org  
alexander.holtzman@sfcityatty.org

By: /s/ Alexander Holtzman

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City and County of San  
Francisco*

Tony LoPresti (SBN 289269)  
COUNTY COUNSEL  
Kavita Narayan (SBN 264191)

1 Meredith A. Johnson (SBN 291018)  
2 Raphael N. Rajendra (SBN 255096)  
3 Hannah M. Godbey (SBN 334475)  
4 OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL  
5 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA  
6 70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Floor  
7 San José, CA 95110  
8 Tel: (408) 299-5900  
9 Kavita.Narayan@cco.sccgov.org  
10 Meredith.Johnson@cco.sccgov.org  
11 Raphael.Rajendra@cco.sccgov.org  
12 Hannah.Godbey@cco.sccgov.org

13 By: /s/ Tony LoPresti

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Santa Clara, Calif.*

15 David J. Hackett (pro hac vice)  
16 General Counsel to King County Executive & Special  
17 Deputy Prosecutor  
18 Alison Holcomb (pro hac vice)  
19 Deputy General Counsel to King County Executive &  
20 Special Deputy Prosecutor  
21 Erin King-Clancy (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
22 Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
23 OFFICE OF KING COUNTY PROSECUTING  
24 ATTORNEY LEESA MANION  
25 401 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 800  
26 Seattle, WA 98104  
27 (206) 477-9483  
28 David.Hackett@kingcounty.gov  
aholcomb@kingcounty.gov  
aclancy@kingcounty.gov

By: /s/ David J. Hackett

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Martin Luther King, Jr. County*

Sharanya Mohan (CABN 350675)  
PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT  
490 43rd Street, Unit #115  
Oakland, CA 94609  
Tel: (510) 738-6788  
sai@publicrightsproject.org

By: /s/ Sharanya Mohan

*Attorney for Plaintiffs Baltimore, MD, Chicago, IL,  
Harris County, TX, and King County, WA*

Christian D. Menefee  
Harris County Attorney  
Jonathan G.C. Fombonne (pro hac vice)  
Deputy County Attorney and First Assistant  
Tiffany Bingham (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
Managing Counsel  
Sarah Utley (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
Division Director – Environmental Division  
Bethany Dwyer (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
Deputy Division Director - Environmental Division  
R. Chan Tysor (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
Senior Assistant County Attorney  
Alexandra “Alex” Keiser (pro hac vice)  
Assistant County Attorney  
1019 Congress, 15th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Tel: (713) 274-5102  
Fax: (713) 437-4211  
jonathan.fombonne@harriscountytexas.gov  
tiffany.bingham@harriscountytexas.gov  
sarah.utley@harriscountytexas.gov  
bethany.dwyer@harriscountytexas.gov  
chan.tysor@harriscountytexas.gov  
alex.keiser@harriscountytexas.gov

By: /s/ Jonathan G.C. Fombonne

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Harris County, Texas*

Mary B. Richardson-Lowry,  
Corporation Counsel of the City of Chicago  
Stephen J. Kane (IL ARDC 6272490) (pro hac vice  
app. forthcoming)  
Rebecca A. Hirsch (IL ARDC 6279592) (pro hac  
vice)  
Lucy Prather (IL ARDC 6337780) (pro hac vice)  
City of Chicago Department of Law,  
Affirmative Litigation Division  
121 N LaSalle Street, Suite 600  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Tel: (312) 744-6934  
Stephen.kane@cityofchicago.org  
Rebecca.Hirsch2@cityofchicago.org  
Lucy.Prather@cityofchicago.org

By: /s/ Stephen J. Kane

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Chicago*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
Ebony M. Thompson  
Baltimore City Solicitor  
Sara Gross (pro hac vice app. forthcoming)  
Chief of Affirmative Litigation  
Baltimore City Department of Law  
100 N. Holliday Street  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202  
Tel: (410) 396-3947  
sara.gross@baltimorecity.gov

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
By: /s/ Sara Gross

*Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Baltimore*